

CNN Student News CNN February 11, 2002 Monday

**PROGRAM-ID:** msnbc2100.0226.15

**LOAD-DATE:** March 29, 2002

Page 696

105 of 111 DOCUMENTS

Content and programming copyright 2002 MSNBC.

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

Transcription Copyright 2002 FDCH e-Media

(f/k/a/ Federal Document Clearing House, Inc.)

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

MSNBC

SHOW: ALAN KEYES IS MAKING SENSE 22:00

February 25, 2002 Monday

**TRANSCRIPT:** # 022500cb.462

**SECTION:** NEWS; INTERNATIONAL

**LENGTH:** 7155 words

**HEADLINE:** Any Hope for Peace in the Middle East?

**BYLINE:** Alan Keyes; Andrea Mitchell; Tom Aspell

**GUESTS:** Hasan Abdel Rahman; Alon Pinkas; Frank Gaffney

**HIGHLIGHT:**

With the reality of intensifying violence in the Middle East, is there any hope for peace in the region? A panel of experts from both sides of the debate discuss the issue. Also, what does the murder of Daniel Pearl mean for U.S. efforts against terrorism?

**BODY:**

THIS IS A RUSH TRANSCRIPT. THIS COPY MAY NOT BE IN ITS FINAL FORM AND MAY BE UPDATED.

ALAN KEYES, HOST: Hi. I'm Alan Keyes. Welcome to MAKING SENSE.

We have got a lot on our plate this evening. Later on, we're going to be talking about the terrible tragedy of Daniel Pearl and what that barbaric act means for overall U.S. efforts against terrorism. But first, we're going out to the Middle East.

We're going to be talking about a situation that has intensifying violence, what seems like a cycle that shows no signs of leading to a positive result. We'll be asking ourselves whether there's any hope.

We have some guests on the program this evening representing both sides and our differing points of view, whether about whether the United States should be more or less involved in activities in that region in light of what appears to be the lack of a real basis for progress. But before we get to our guests, let's get the latest developments from NBC's Andrea Mitchell.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

Page 697

MSNBC February 25, 2002 Monday

ANDREA MITCHELL, NBC NEWS CORRESPONDENT (voice-over): A Palestinian man and his pregnant wife rushing to the hospital to give birth, shot by Israeli soldiers at a roadblock. A day in the life of Israelis and Palestinians while politicians once again start to talk peace.

Her baby girl survives. Her husband does not. While south of Bethlehem, a nine months pregnant Jewish settler shot in the stomach during an ambush by Palestinian gunmen. She and her baby also survive. The day's toll: two infants born in trauma, five dead, and at least 10 wounded when Palestinians open fire at a bus stop in a disputed part of Jerusalem.

This, as Israeli newspapers herald a new peace proposal from the most influential Arab leader, Saudi Arabia's Crown Prince Abdullah. His plan: Israel withdraws from territory it won in the 1967 Arab-Israeli War, giving



CNN Student News CNN February 11, 2002 Monday

Palestinians the state they have long demanded. In return, all Arab countries recognize Israel with full diplomatic relations and trade.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It was a signal to the Israeli people that peace between Israel and the broader Arab world is possible.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Another acceptance from the Saudis would signal a normalization. It would embolden other Arab states to come on board.

MITCHELL: But will Israel start negotiating before a cease-fire?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I doubt however in the current violence that there's any Israeli who's willing to countenance a concession to the Palestinians.

MITCHELL (on camera): Tonight, Israeli officials are even inviting the Saudi leader to Jerusalem for unprecedented talks. But a Saudi official tells NBC News Israel is going to have to deal with Yasser Arafat, saying, quote, "If they want to talk, tell them to go down the street and talk to him." And so far, that is not happening.

Andrea Mitchell, NBC News, Washington.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

KEYES: Looks like in this era again, a region that has many times in our lifetimes and in the lifetimes of those before us been a source of terrible anguish to everyone who sees what's going on there is causing that grief again. And we ask ourselves, is there any hope? Can it get anywhere? Is there anything that we can do to end that cycle of what looks like banal and senseless killing and violence on both sides?

We're going to be looking at some of the key questions this evening. We'll be asking ourselves whether there is, in fact, in light of what appears to be right now a deadlock and stalemate, still hope for peace in that region.

We'll be asking ourselves as well, which is fraudulent, the participants or the process? Something is wrong here.

And we really need to be getting to the bottom of whether it's the personalities involved or whether it's the structure, the concepts with which we

Page 698  
MSNBC February 25, 2002 Monday

have over the years been approaching this Mid-East region and conflict.

And finally, the question for the United States: what should the U.S. do? How can we, in fact, play a constructive role? Or is there one that we can play?

We'll be looking at those questions with a panel of experts later on in the program.

But up front tonight, we have Hasan Rahman, the Palestinian Liberation Organization's chief representative to the United States, and Alon Pinkas, the Israeli Consul General in New York. Gentlemen, welcome to MAKING SENSE.

As we look at the Middle East, that is, in fact, the real challenge for a lot of people in the United States and around the world, trying to make sense out of a conflict that in many ways in the cycle of violence and the deaths of so many innocent people seems to a lot of folks around the world to have long since reached a senseless stage. As we watch what's going on there, Hasan Rahman, is there, in fact, any hope that a process leading to peace can emerge from the events we see going on today?

**HASAN ABDEL RAHMAN, SPOKESMAN, PALESTINIAN LIBERATION ORGANIZATION:** We have

no option but to be hopeful. But in order to achieve peace in our region, there needs to be an end to Israel's 35 years of military occupation of the Palestinians.

In other words, Israel must stop controlling the lives of the Palestinians, must recognize the Palestinians as its neighbors in a state of their own over part of their historic homeland, and the Palestinians will recognize Israel



CNN Student News CNN February 11, 2002 Monday

within the 1967 boundaries. This is the condition for a peace that will give hope for peace for both peoples, Israelis and Palestinians.

But if the Israeli government continues to want to control the lives of the Palestinians, to build Jewish settlements in Palestinian territories, to impose its whim on the Palestinians, I don't think that we can expect any peace in the near future. It is in the hands of the Israelis.

Today, we have Prince Abdullah, Saudi Arabia, coming up with an initiative that presents an opportunity for the Israelis to have peace with all the Arab countries combined. I think they should grab it because it coincides with international legality. It coincides with the conditions and prerequisites for achieving peace.

KEYES: Let's take a look -- wait, wait one second now. Let's take a look at the other side of the coin. Alon Pinkas, do you think that, in fact, Israel is now the chief obstacle as Hasan Rahman has portrayed it, to getting out of this situation and onto a path that can lead to a positive result?

PINKAS: No I do not, Alan. In fact, I agree with almost everything that Abdel Rahman said. The thing is that every time we sought to address that, every time we sought to solve that, every time we sought to engage or embark in a serious peace process, we have encountered nothing but hatred, terrorism, and violence on behalf of the Palestinians.

Now, what he calls occupation we thought we were on the verge of ending at Camp David last year. They refused and rejected the comprehensive offer that was

Page 699  
MSNBC February 25, 2002 Monday

made to them then. In fact, in modern history, there is no parallel or no comparable national liberation movement as the Palestinians are, which is predicated on nothing but the negation of another national liberation movement. Now, as for what Mr. Rahman said about the chances or hopes of to peace, I agree with that, too. The demography, the geography, the inevitability of these two processes converging at some point towards coexistence is almost inevitable. The thing is that you need a credible, a serious, leadership on the Palestinian side, something that we do not have.

KEYES: So are you saying -- let me interrupt for a second. Are you saying, Alon Pinkas, that Yasser Arafat is, in fact, the obstacle to peace, that it's his lack of leadership that is creating the problem right now?

PINKAS: I am saying that Yasser Arafat has never been a serious statesman. I am saying that Yasser Arafat has never seriously transformed himself from a terrorist-slash-guerrilla-slash-semi-statesman into a serious leader that makes serious decisions, that is ready to act on them, to deliver them, and to seriously back them with the political will and political power.

KEYES: Hasan Rahman, the question -- one second before you answer, though. But the question I always have when I listen to this exchange is a very clear one. I don't think that you can make peace if you can't keep the peace. It's very simple formula.

But it's a question that I think has to be put to Mr. Arafat. If he cannot stop violence, how can he deliver peace because peace is the absence of violence? Does he have control over the forces on his side?

RAHMAN: You know, I think that the question is, with all due respect, wrongly posed. How can you expect a people who are subject to all forms of aggression and oppression on a daily basis to be able to provide peace to the aggressor? Remember that this situation is not the product of one month or two months. This is a situation that is the product of 36 years of Israel's military occupation of the Palestinian territories, over which Israel has built Jewish settlements in the heart of the Palestinian territories.

CNN Student News CNN February 11, 2002 Monday

It's the next part of Jerusalem. It refuses to withdraw and imposes a state of siege on 3.2 million Palestinians, makes their life miserable. This is the only people today in the whole world that live under foreign military occupation. And, yet, we are asking Yasser Arafat to guarantee the security of the state of Israel. That's absurd.

PINKAS: What you need to do...

KEYES: One second, though, because you're still not -- I just want a simple answer, though. I understand the difficulties and complexities that you're pointing out. But part of what you seem to have said, as I hear it, is that in point of fact, given the situation in which the Palestinians find themselves, they cannot stop outbreaks of violence on their side. Is that true?

RAHMAN: No, what I am saying is that in order to be able to achieve that kind of requirements that you're asking for, Israel must change its attitude towards

Page 700

MSNBC February 25, 2002 Monday

the Palestinians and its behavior in the occupied territories.

You just heard Mrs. Andrea Mitchell saying today a man accompanying his wife to give birth to his baby, and he was shot, and she was shot on a military checkpoint inside the city of Nablus. She was not shot in Tel Aviv. She was shot inside a Palestinian city. This is untenable.

KEYES: One second. Hasan, one second. Alon Pinkas, I listen to that, and obviously, we're all of us moved by the spectacle of violence on one side and the other. But I put to you the same question. Can Yasser Arafat be expected to make peace in a true sense if he can't keep the peace?

But if he, in fact, can't keep the peace, why does Israel go on acting as if they can deal with him on an equal basis? Isn't that, in fact, a delusion, that they're not willing to deal with Arafat on an equal basis because he can't deliver the goods?

PINKAS: Yes, in essence it is a delusion that we're trying to go around, for lack of a better alternative. If the Palestinians were a Democratic society, had a Democratic system with a due process of political change, then perhaps we could have negotiated with someone else. But if you look at their track record, if you look at their history, and let me run by you quickly the glorious accomplishments of the Palestinian leadership.

In 1937, partition was offered. It was rejected. In 1947, the U.N. Security Council partitioned the land. It was rejected. In 1967, after the Six-Day War, still in June of 1967, we had proposed to relinquish control over the newly-acquired-slash-occupied territories, however you choose to term that. There was no one to talk to. Again in 1982, then the Oslo process, which never fully materialized because Arafat could not assert his authority.

Now, there comes a point where you have to say this is not about occupation. You're going to have to trust me, Alan. Three-point-two million Palestinians are not our cup of tea. We have no reason, we have no want, we have no desire to control their lives.

KEYES: Can we serious expect, though, Alon, that the Saudi proposal that would take Israel back to the time when it had a waist, what, 10, 12 miles wide, that that is going to fly? Is that acceptable given the uncertainties that exist about the ability of the other side to keep the peace?

PINKAS: Well, that's a good question. I have not seen this proposal. Perhaps you have. Perhaps Mr. Rahman has.

What I have seen is a very nicely written column by Tom Friedman in the "New York Times" detailing a speech that has not been delivered, stuck in the right-hand drawer of Prince Abdullah's desk. There is a lot of importance that you should attribute to something called public diplomacy in the Middle East. I



CNN Student News CNN February 11, 2002 Monday

am awaiting this speech to be delivered in Arabic...

KEYES: Alon, I'm going to have to interrupt both of you. Wait, wait, wait, one second, interrupt both of you because we've come unfortunately to the end of our time. I hope that this will only be the first of our conversations because I think we're just, as always with the Middle East, scratching the surface. But I

Page 701

MSNBC February 25, 2002 Monday

appreciate your taking the time to come out tonight and help us get a little closer to some understanding of the issues that are on the table.

Next, we're going to get to the heart of the matter with a panel of experts who will be looking at this from various points of view and asking especially a question about U.S. engagement in this process. Plus, our open phone line segment. You can call me at 1-866-KEYES-USA with whatever is on your mind. And later, my "Outrage of the Day," what some are calling a dangerous sexual activity.

But, first, does this make sense? In California, the supreme court there, the state supreme court has struck down the law that prevents criminals from benefiting from their crimes by getting ill-gotten gains, the proceeds of books and other things that they might put out as a result of their crime.

Now, let me see here. We deprive these felons of their other rights. We don't let them walk the street and go around doing what they please. The one right we're going leave in their hands is the right to make obscene profits from their murders and crimes? Does that make sense?

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

YASSER ARAFAT, PALESTINIAN LEADER: I am repeating in front of you, we are committed completely to the peace of (UNINTELLIGIBLE) and the peace process.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

KEYES: One of the key figures, obviously, in the Middle East, and one about whom all kinds of questions are now swirling in terms of his ability to act as a valid inter locker in a process that might lead to peace. We're talk about whether or not prospects for peace in the Middle East are now a hopeless cause in light of what appears to be once again a cycle of violence and deadlock on both sides.

Joining us now to get to the heart of the matter is Raymond Tanter, a fellow at the Washington Institute for Near East Policy. Also with us is Nancy Soderberg, once the U.S. representative to the U.N. Security council and a member of former President Clinton's National Security Council. And Hussein Ibish, the communications director for the Arab-American Anti-Discrimination Committee.

I want to start putting before all of you, but starting I think with Hussein Ibish, the question that I put to the two inter lockers in the first segment. We have in Yasser Arafat somebody who, whatever his intentions and so forth and so on, seems to be under a cloud now in terms of whether or not he can, in fact, deliver peace.

After all, if you're going to make concessions to somebody, one of the things that you want to get in return is a cessation of violence. And if the forces on that side of the table aren't under control, aren't under somebody's control, that means that peace cannot be delivered. If Arafat can't keep the peace, can he, in fact, make peace, Hussein Ibish?

Page 702

MSNBC February 25, 2002 Monday

HUSSEIN IBISH, ARAB-AMERICAN ANTI-DISCRIMINATION COMMITTEE: Yeah, peace can be made between Israelis and Palestinians. This is not a conflict between two

CNN Student News CNN February 11, 2002 Monday

individuals, between Sharon and Arafat. It doesn't boil down to Yasser Arafat. It's about two societies at each other's throat. And they're at each other's throat because there is a military occupation going on. And people live under conditions, absolutely appalling conditions with no rights whatsoever under the control of a hostile and abusive foreign army.

As long as you have that occupation taking place in the face of half-measures and partial deals and slow-moving progress, I don't know. I don't think at this stage anybody can stop resistance, including violent resistance, against that occupation. The occupation has to end. It has to end...

KEYES: Wait a second now, Hussein. Does that mean -- hold on, hold on. Does that mean -- because I heard the same thing just now from Mr. Rahman. And it sounds to me like you're saying in point of fact nobody on the Arab side can, in fact, stop the violence.

IBISH: What I'm saying -- yes, in fact, Israel was unable to suppress...

(CROSSTALK)

IBISH: ... I don't think the Palestinian Authority will be able to do it either.

(CROSSTALK)

KEYES: Wait one second. I want to get to everybody. But let me go to Nancy Soderberg because that strikes me as unfortunately a very interesting both admission and problem, Nancy Soderberg.

In point of fact, if we're dealing with one side of the table, where for whatever reasons, could be historic, could be psychological, could be objective results of oppression and so forth, as they argue. But the truth is, if you're going to make peace, both sides have to be able to deliver a cessation of violence. Is there a prospect for peace, Nancy Soderberg, if that can't come about?

NANCY SODERBERG, AMBASSADOR, MEMBER, CLINTON NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL:

Well,

I think the question is can Yasser Arafat stop the violence and pave the way forward for a renewed negotiation? I think the answer is, yes, absolutely he can. He's chosen not ever since the Intifada started a year-and-a-half ago. He has not done the 100 percent effort that Senator George Mitchell required of him. And what you have here is a situation spiraling out of control where you have an Israeli prime minister who was elected on a pledge to deliver security to the people, which he's failed to do, and Yasser Arafat who's on a campaign to show that the Palestinians are victims in order to try and exert more pain on the Israelis than they are on themselves, which is not exactly the way to get to peace or have an independent Palestinian state.

What you need to do is step back and restart negotiations. I think the Saudi offer provides perhaps a new dynamic that the Bush administration should step in

Page 703  
MSNBC February 25, 2002 Monday  
immediately and take advantage of.

KEYES: Raymond Tanter, do you think that that is, in fact, the case? I mean, it seems to me we're looking at a situation here where Nancy Soderberg is suggesting maybe that Arafat is a fraud and that, in fact, he doesn't have the will to stop the violence. And yet, if he does not, what sense would it make for the Israelis to look at any proposal if in point in fact any concessions they make will not result in a cessation of violence?

RAYMOND TANTER, FELLOW, WASHINGTON INSTITUTION FOR NEAR EAST POLICY: Well, Alan, I don't think that Nancy said that Yasser Arafat was a fraud.

Nevertheless, let's face it. There is a war going on on the ground. And a peace process is not the way you end a war.



CNN Student News CNN February 11, 2002 Monday

Wars end when one side dominates the other side. And I think the Israelis have dominated the Palestinians, and the Palestinians should sue for peace. But for some reason, the Palestinians haven't felt enough pain, it seems.

So I think there has to be much -- I don't think the conflict is ripe for any kind of a peace process. And the Bush administration is doing precisely the right thing to leave the conflict alone until the parties themselves get to the point where they want to make some kind of an accord.

IBISH: Alan, what you're missing in your whole formulation here is that violence is not just one-on-one individual violence. The occupation is a system of daily violence.

Everything about living under occupation is violent. It means being surrounded by a hostile and abusive foreign army, pass laws, curfews, being shot at checkpoints, torture, living under separate and unequal laws. Everything in the occupied territories, every aspect of daily life, depends on whether you're an Arab or a Jew.

It is the most radical system of racial discrimination on the planet today.

I'm telling you that if all forms of violence are to end, the occupation has to end fully, completely and quickly.

SODERBERG: And Yasser Arafat has a way out of that, which is to end the violence and negotiate a lasting peace with Israel. And he has...

IBISH: But Israel won't do it.

SODERBERG: ... well, they had a very good chance with President Clinton towards the end of his term putting together a deal, which was maybe three percent, maybe five percent of the final deal. And instead of negotiating the last three to five percent, they started the Intifada. And we are where we are right now.

(CROSSTALK)

KEYES: Hold on, hold on, hold on a second because I want to clarify something that Nancy Soderberg just said. I mean, you're suggesting at the end of the Clinton years it wasn't a situation where there was no progress of any kind whatsoever. But in point of fact, we had reached a certain point where a certain

Page 704

MSNBC February 25, 2002 Monday

kind of autonomy seemed to be handed to the Palestinians. Are you suggesting they didn't make good use of that opportunity?

SODERBERG: No question they didn't make -- I mean, you can argue that the deal was perfect or not perfect or close enough. But it was pretty close to what the final deal is going to be. And instead of negotiating the last small points that were out there, albeit very symbolic, they chose to resume the violence.

IBISH: This is just historically inaccurate.

KEYES: Wait one second. Hussein Ibish, why weren't they satisfied with that?

IBISH: Hold on. This is historically inaccurate. The Palestinians negotiated and continued negotiating up to and including the Tabah talks right before the Israeli elections in February. And there was progress made, according to both sides, in late January, early February, at Tabah.

So, that's not true. It's the Israeli government that cut off negotiations, all negotiations, in February because General Sharon wants to go for a military victory. He believes he can crush the will of the Palestinians, break them, and force them to accept Israel's rule over them.

KEYES: One problem, though, Hussein Ibish, one problem, though, with what I hear you saying, and I think it's what Nancy Soderberg is pointing to, is that a point had been reached where it seemed as if we were lining up forces on both sides. Arafat had an opportunity to try to put together security forces that would deal with the Palestinian side. And the Israeli response, the difficulty

CNN Student News CNN February 11, 2002 Monday

was that acts of violence and terrorism that claimed the lives of Israeli civilians continued. If that sort of war making continues, can a government just sit back and take it?

IBISH: Well, what I think has to happen is that the Israeli government has to face up to its responsibility as well. It has no business maintaining tens of thousands of heavily armed troops and hundreds of thousands of settlers outside of its borders. It has an obligation under international law to withdraw.

Israel occupied southern Lebanon for many years and said it couldn't withdraw. Finally, last year, it did withdraw. The border has been quiet. If the Israeli troops and their settlers went back to Israel, the border will be quiet. If they free the Palestinians, then the Palestinians will leave them alone.

KEYES: Now, Raymond Tanter, go ahead.

SODERBERG: Can you get some kind of negotiation -- you can have this rhetorical debate all night and get nowhere, which is what is happening on the ground.

IBISH: That's an admission that I'm right.

SODERBERG: I think that you need to get a peace process going. And the truth is that over the last decade, the only time you've had -- more than that, two decades -- the only time you've had peace on the ground in the Middle East is when the United States led the effort to forge the peace.

Page 705

MSNBC February 25, 2002 Monday

KEYES: Wait a second, wait a second, Nancy. If I heard Raymond Tanter correctly...

TANTER: Yes, I'd like to get a word in here.

KEYES: ... go ahead.

TANTER: It seems to me that Hussein Ibish should have been out in Salt Lake. He would have gotten the gold medal for being the victim of the year. The Palestinians have to take responsibility for what's going on on the ground. As Nancy pointed out, the Palestinians had a deal at Tabah that they rejected. The Palestinians rejected deals in '37, in '47, in '82. The Palestinians have been boycotting the peace process. It's time for the Palestinians to shape up...

(CROSSTALK)

KEYES: Before you all start in again because we're coming close to the wire...

IBISH: That's inaccurate (UNINTELLIGIBLE)...

KEYES: ... Hussein Ibish, hold on a second. I have a thought that I want to leave with you because obviously our little get-together this evening is just the beginning of what I hope will be an ongoing discussion.

But I've got to tell you, what I hear from one side and the other suggests a couple of things. First of all, it suggests that we're not really going to make any progress if we don't see on the side of the Palestinians the development of some kind of cohesive, acceptable, valid political entity.

And I think that for the Israelis to fail to cooperate in that process means that they won't have a valid inter locker. But on the other hand, I think, Hussein Ibish, it sounds to me as if you're just stubbornly failing to look at a reality. People can't make peace if other folks are continuing to kill them dead. They won't accept that...

(CROSSTALK)

KEYES: Hang on. They won't accept that as peace.

IBISH: You're failing to see the most basic element of the facts, which is that the people who are the aggressors here are those...

KEYES: That doesn't matter...



CNN Student News CNN February 11, 2002 Monday

(CROSSTALK)

KEYES: ... One second. No, it doesn't. Hussein, you'll have to stop for a second. We'll get back to this I hope at some other time. But one thought I would want to leave with you, you can't take the victim status as an excuse for not bearing responsibility for the peace. That won't work.

Page 706

MSNBC February 25, 2002 Monday

(CROSSTALK)

KEYES: No, no, it won't work. It won't wash if you continue to try it, it makes the whole situation hopeless.

(CROSSTALK)

KEYES: And I think -- hold it, hold it. And I think what I heard from both you and Mr. Rahman this evening suggests that you need to step back and ask yourselves, do we really want to portray the Palestinian side as if they are helpless victims who therefore inevitably and without any control must be impelled to violence, because if that's the case...

IBISH: That's not what we're saying at all...

KEYES: ... there is no hope of dealing with that.

IBISH: ... (UNINTELLIGIBLE)...

KEYES: ... Anyway, thank you all. I have to thank you all now. Thank you very much for coming in. Thanks for the lively discussion. Hope to have you back before too long to continue this chat.

Next, we'll turn our attention to the terrible murder of Danny Pearl and what conclusions we should draw from it about America's larger war on terrorism. And later, I'll get to what's on your mind, plus, of course, my "Outrage of the Day" and what some people in Congress are thinking about sex is probably more dangerous than what most people are doing.

But, first, does this make sense? What do Erskine Bowles, Andrew Cuomo, Robert Reich, Janet Reno, and Bill Richardson all have in common? Well, I'll tell you. They're all running for political office. And they're all running away from Bill Clinton as fast as they can. Erskine Bowles won't even put his name on his resume. Let me tell you that.

Here are people who stood proudly with him during the administration. Now they have forgotten who he is, apparently. Do you think that that makes sense?

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

KEYES: Obviously, over the course of the weekend, the barbaric murder of "Wall Street Journal" reporter Daniel Pearl has been on all our hearts and minds. We obviously react with grief but also with outrage. In a sense, as we responded to September 11, as we have to the whole terrorism -- something must be done.

Before we get to our guest, Frank Gaffney, to talk about that very question.

Here's NBC's Tom Aspell, reporting tonight from Karachi.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

TOM ASPELL, NBC CORRESPONDENT (voice-over): Handcuffed, hooded and under heavy guard. Chief suspect Sayeed Omar Sheikh and two of his accomplices at Karachi's high court today. Ordered jailed for another two weeks while police

Page 707

MSNBC February 25, 2002 Monday

look for the body of Daniel Pearl.

Four months ago, the U.S. Justice Department issued a secret indictment for Sheikh for kidnapping another American in India in 1994. Indian police rescued him and three European hostages and captured Sheikh then, but freed him five years later in exchange for more than 160 passengers on an Indian airliner hijacked to Afghanistan.

CNN Student News CNN February 11, 2002 Monday

In early January, American Ambassador Wendy Chamberlain pressed Pakistani officials to find Sheik and send him to the U.S. But before he could be caught, Sheik apparently enticed Daniel Pearl to a meeting, which is led to his disappearance and brutal execution.

President Bush said in Washington today the U.S. wants Sheikh extradited from Pakistan.

GEORGE W. BUSH, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES: We're always interested in -- in dealing with people who have harmed American citizens.

ASPELL: While Pakistani and American law officers hunt for more evidence against Sheikh, details of his kidnapping career in India are emerging.

(on camera): Sheik used a natural charm and a first class British education to lure his victims, easily making friends with foreigners impressed by his language skills and intelligent conversation. Sheikh met British tourist, Trevor Matthews in India eight years ago. He invited him sightseeing but turned up late for their appointment. Matthews changed his mind and probably saved his own life.

TREVOR MATTHEWS: There were plans made here. And I should have been -- I still think I should have been the first person that he abducted.

ASPELL: When Matthews found out later Sheikh had kidnapped four other foreigners, he was totally surprised.

MATTHEWS: He seemed too much of a gentleman, almost too considerate to actually draw a gun on someone and hold them captive.

ASPELL: Without Daniel Pearl's body and the murder weapon, the case against Sheik in Pakistan is incomplete. But he's now on America's list of wanted terrorists and could soon face trial in the U.S.

Tom Aspell, NBC News, Karachi.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

KEYES: Joining us now is Frank Gaffney, the founder and president for the Center for Security Policy. Frank wrote a piece in today's "Wall Street Journal" entitled How America Must Respond to barbarism.

Frank, welcome to MAKING SENSE.

FRANK GAFFNEY, CENTER FOR SECURITY POLICY: Thank you, Alan.

Page 708

MSNBC February 25, 2002 Monday

KEYES: As we look at the Daniel Pearl tragedy, and the response of the American people to that tragedy, I think it's always a combination of both grief and compassion and outrage against the evil perpetrators of the deed. I myself think, though, that we have to avoid the temptation to see this just in terms of this particular act and reacting to it.

How do we set it in the larger context of the on going war that we have to fight against terrorism? A point I think that you made very well in your piece today?

GAFFNEY: Well, I completely agree. I think that the way we have to look at it is it demonstrates that we as individuals are on the frontlines of this war on terrorism. It's not just, as September 11 demonstrated, we are all in some sort of random way at risk in our own country of a terrorist attack of some kind, but if we travel overseas, as many of us do whether for study or for business or for commerce of some other kind -- or simply to travel and experience the world. We are now, unless there is a very clear signal sent to those who are thinking of emulating Danny Pearl's kidnappers, we are all perspective targets for this kind of terrorist attack.

KEYES: Now tell me --

GAFFNEY: That's why I think the president has got take this war to the terrorists.



CNN Student News CNN February 11, 2002 Monday

KEYES: Well, how do we do that? I think that is a point that I guess a lot of us have been making for quite some time in terms of the need to really find a way, to be aggressive and proactive and carrying this war to the terrorists. He mentioned in the State of the Union Address that there are cells all over the world. What, in fact, is the kind of response that's going to help in terms of eliminating the actual terrorists who are doing these kinds of things and posing this threat?

GAFFNEY: Well, I think it's sort of a three-part problem. The first part we've seen playing out, I'm delighted to say in Afghanistan, where we've gone after one of the most egregious safe havens of terrorists, and we've basically put it out of business.

We've put, at least the al Qaeda leadership and forces, and their Taliban sponsors on the run. There needs to be a second phase, the president alluded to that in the State of the Union Address where we look at, and bring pressure to bear in appropriate ways on other state sponsors of terrorism.

And then a third part is, I think, we have to send a very powerful signal, by prosecuting, or as the president very colorfully put it, bringing justice to those who have done things like what Danny Pearl is doing --

KEYES: Let me interrupt you for one sec, though, because it seems we talk around this subject. We speak in euphemisms. I know it might be a little difficult to put it directly. But let me try to put it directly. Isn't it the case that if there are in fact people like this in cells around the world, that we have to try to find out who they are and where they are, and basically eliminate them before they eliminate them before they eliminate them before

Page 709

MSNBC February 25, 2002 Monday

Americans?

GAFFNEY: Yes, I think that's right. The word that is in some vogue thanks to Don Rumsfeld candor is we have to kill them.

KEYES: Yes, I think that that is the part, because lot of Americans seem to shy away from this possibility somewhat. And yet I don't see what the alternative is. If, in fact, we are fighting a war, we must carry that war to the enemy. And what other way is there with these terrorists, but to seek them out and to wipe out their cells before they're able to act.

GAFFNEY: Well, I don't think there is a way. It's difficult because of limitations on intelligence, always to know where they are or who they are before they act. But I think a much more proactive approach, and one that, as we've talked about before, Alan, requires a different approach to intelligence, namely the use of human resources to penetrate these cells and establish who are the enemy and what are they up to is absolutely paramount at this point. And I hope this is an approach the administration is adopting.

KEYES: Now given the fact that as the president himself has said, you have these kinds of cells and organized structures in different parts of the world, you must deal with the sponsor states and the facilitators. But isn't it the case in Europe and elsewhere you're liable to find these kinds of cells, don't we need, in fact, to have a structure of international cooperation that will allow us to identify and go after these people without ruffling too many feathers in other countrys?

GAFFNEY: Well, it certainly is to be preferred. The danger is in cases where some of the governments are actually aligned with these folks, an example being Pakistan. Where there's reason believe, and there's some very interesting reporting on it in today's papers, the Pakistani Intelligence Service may well have been implicated in some aspects of this kidnapping and perhaps even in the execution of Danny Pearl. That's a problem.

CNN Student News CNN February 11, 2002 Monday

The French who are very well established appeasers of terrorism have said well, you can operate here, just don't do anything against us. You have other countries, of course, where you have, notably in Iraq, I believe active support, and arming of terrorists taking place. These are different kinds of problems that require different solutions, but you're absolutely right. It would be far preferable to have people's help, but in the absence of it, I think we are going to have to be willing to and be able to act with some independence against these terrorists.

KEYES: And that would mean that we would have to be willing to put together the kind of elite teams and forces that are needed sometimes to deal with these cells, other training camps, things like this and basically move across international borders into these countries in order to wipe them out in a timely way before they can strike against us. Do you think we have to basically have the will and resolve to take that kind of step?

GAFFNEY: Well, I think we do have to have the will and resolve. I think we have the capability. I think we have got elite forces and covert operations forces that are capable of these kinds of missions. The Israelis have been doing it in their defense for a long time, and I think we have to be and be willing to do it in ours.

MSNBC February 25, 2002 Monday

do it in ours.

KEYES: Thank you, Frank, I really appreciate that. I appreciate your being with us.

We are, in fact, going to be getting further into this very topic. On this show tomorrow. We've assembled some folks to talk further about the kind of proactive policies that are needed, what their implications are, what kind of structures we might put together diplomatically and otherwise to facilitate what needs to be done.

You'll want to stay tuned for that discussion of the real war on terrorism in its actual and proactive phase as we'll be trying to do it tomorrow here on this program.

Later, on this very show, my outrage of the day! But first, I want to hear what's on your mind. Your watching MSNBC, the best news on cable.

ANNOUNCER: Alan Keyes is MAKING SENSE on MSNBC.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

KEYES: Welcome back to MAKING SENSE. Now, I have a chance to have some fun. Get to find out what's on your mind. We're going to go first to Scott in Florida. Scott, are you MAKING SENSE?

CALLER: Oh, I'm MAKING SENSE, Alan. I don't know about some of your guests. I think that the Israelis should get out of the Palestinian occupied territories. And I know if somebody were occupying here in the United States, that I would probably be doing the same thing as the Palestinians.

KEYES: Well, you know, there is a history to that, though, Scott that we can't forget. Given the fact that the Israelis took these territories during the '67 war after they were aggressed against by Arab states who had refused to accept their existence for decades.

And so part of what's going on here is to try to achieve some kind of negotiated settlement after many years of warfare which resulted in the Israelis holding on to this territory. And that's part of the reason that we're faced with the situation we are. Scott, thank you for your call.

CALLER: Sure, no problem.

KEYES: Let's go to Robert in New York. Robert, welcome to MAKING SENSE.

CALLER: Hello, Mr. Keyes. You're absolutely right about the 1967 war and I commend you for saying it.



CNN Student News CNN February 11, 2002 Monday

I'm calling about the suicide bombers in Israel. America would never accept suicide bombers blowing up our civilians in restaurants, malls and other public areas in American cities, but would respond with overwhelming military force. Why should Israel sit idly by and do nothing to protect their own citizens from these suicide bombers who are considered heroes and martyrs by the Palestinians and the Arab world.

Page 711

MSNBC February 25, 2002 Monday

KEYES: Well, I agree with you, Robert. I don't see how we could expect the Israelis to accept that. That's one of the reasons why I put such an emphasis on the need to conduct negotiations by requiring, expecting, in fact, that both sides will keep the peace. And until Arafat proves that he can, I think there's going to be real difficulty in this so-called process.

Let's go to Hank in New Jersey. Hank, welcome to MAKING SENSE.

CALLER: Hey, Alan, I'm a long-time admirer and I voted for you.

KEYES: Thank you. I appreciate it.

CALLER: The Palestinian spokesman before asked how can people oppressed have peace with their oppressors? And all I can say is, Alan, tell them about Martin Luther King Jr. Jesus loves you.

KEYES: Thank you, Hank. Really appreciate it. Martin Luther King, Mahatma Gandhi, others who found ways to deal with oppression. And I think that's a reason, by the way, a lot of people don't realize why non-violence was such an important tool in their hands. Because it showed that oppression did not objectify the oppressed that, in fact, they were still the masters of their own fate and will and soul.

Quickly to Nate in California. Welcome to MAKING SENSE.

CALLER: Hi, Alan. I was wondering if you could answer a question for me.

KEYES: I'll try.

CALLER: What's -- because I'm too young to remember -- what's the difference between Iran supporting the Hamas and us supporting what we call freedom fighters such as the Contras?

KEYES: Well, I think, first of all, we're looking at two very different situations. In our particular case, we were trying to maintain a path towards some kind of freedom and democracy in our hemisphere against those who were establishing governments to repress that, and basically helping people fight for their freedom.

I think in the Middle East you have differences that go back to ideology, to territory, and people are feeding the flames of that violence in such a way as to prevent peace from coming about. So the results and the objectives are very different.

Thank you for your calls and e-mails. Next, my out rage of the day. Some folks back there on Capitol Hill are having strange ideas about what constitutes dangerous approaches to sexuality. I'll tell you about that when we get back.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

KEYES: President Bush in his budget actually proposed an increase for abstinence only education with respect to human sexuality. But three representatives in the Congress, James C. Greenwood of Pennsylvania Republican, California Democrat Barbara Lee and Lynn Woolsey said in a letter to President

Page 712

MSNBC February 25, 2002 Monday

Bush a few days ago, that in point of fact, abstinence-only education is dangerous and unnecessary. So let me see here, Colin Powell recommending condoms which has a one in six chance of failing, like playing condom roulette with one bullet in the chamber -- that's safe and wonderful? But if we tell the kids not

CNN Student News CNN February 11, 2002 Monday

to engage in this dangerous behavior at all at their ages, then that's dangerous? Ha! That's an outrageous statement and they ought to know it. That's my sense of it. Lester Holt is up next. See you tomorrow.

**LOAD-DATE:** July 9, 2003

Page 713

106 of 111 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 2002 CNBC, Inc.

CNBC News Transcripts

**SHOW:** Hardball with Chris Matthews (9:00 PM ET) - CNBC

**February 22, 2002 Friday**

**LENGTH:** 1095 words

**HEADLINE:** PLO's **Hasan Abdel Rahman** and Israeli consul Alon Pinkas discuss a Washington Post story which alleges that Yasser Arafat pulled a gun on his security chief during an argument

**ANCHORS:** CHRIS MATTHEWS

**BODY:**

CHRIS MATTHEWS, host:

So who's in charge of this picture? Is there a rift in the Palestinian Authority? The Washington Post is reporting today that Yasser Arafat pulled out a gun on one of his top deputies, Mr. Rajoub, the security chief of the West Bank, during a discussion about a jail break in Hebron. **Hasan Abdel Rahman** is the chief representative for the PLO here in the United States, and Alon Pinkas is the Israeli consul general up in New York.

Let me ask you this, Mr. Rahman. What do you make of your--your guy pulling a gun on one of his guys?

Mr. **HASAN ABDEL RAHMAN** (PLO Spokesman): First of all, I don't think it is true. It's a rumor. Even the story in the Washington Post does not say it happened. They said that there were rumors that it happened. My information that it did not happen...

MATTHEWS: I can't believe they said 'rumors,' but go ahead.

Mr. RAHMAN: Yes. I did...

MATTHEWS: I've never heard the Post report rumors.

Mr. RAHMAN: I saw the--the report, and I spoke to the people there. You know, you have a little discussion, but I think it is--it is blown out of proportion, even the Washington Post story.

MATTHEWS: Does Mr. Arafat carry a gun?

Mr. RAHMAN: He always carries a gun.

MATTHEWS: Does he ever draw it?

Mr. RAHMAN: I don't know. I--I didn't see him do that.

Page 714

CNBC News Transcripts February 22, 2002 Friday

MATTHEWS: See, most world leaders don't carry sidearms. That's why it confesses a reasonable discussion point.

Mr. RAHMAN: No. I don't think that's really very important issue. First of all, the relationship between Jibril Rajoub and Yasser Arafat is a very close relationship. They have worked together for the last 21 years. I know how close to each other they are. They might have had a disagreement over something, but it is not to the extent where it was reported in the media.

MATTHEWS: Was there--let me just get to the bottom of the quarrel, apparently, between Arafat and his deputy--security chief. It concerned the release of some prisoners that were under the custody of the pi--Palestinian Authority. Do you know about that aspect of the story?

Mr. RAHMAN: Again, it is rumored. I don't think there were many people there. There were only two people sitting there, and I don't think any of them